

MEMO Number TSR02

DATE: 2022-11-04

TO: Dr. LaBerge

FROM: UHDRTZ

SUBJECT: Progress report for October

1 INTRODUCTION

This memo provides the progress report required by Capstone. This report covers the period October 1 - November 1.

2 COMPLETED WORK

- 2.1 Completed and presented SRR
- 2.2 Met with Prof. Dyer (customer)
- 2.3 Met with Gavin Ward, a member of the previous team, to review files and discuss work that needs to be done
 - 2.3.1 Got access to previous team's GitHub
- 2.4 Started to work on Boot-on-Start service

3 WORK EXPECTED DURING NEXT PERIOD

- 3.1 Complete Boot-on-Start service
- 3.2 Work on remote SSH capabilities
- 3.3 Look into 4K output
 - 3.3.1 Identify bottlenecks within the system

4 ISSUES FROM PREVIOUS REPORTS

4.1 Current Issues

- 4.1.1 None

4.2 Older Issues

- 4.2.1 None

F22 Ethics Assignment

1. Dr. LaBerge should ignore Inmarsat's instructions and release the paper to the committee.
 - a. This is not the best course of action due to Dr. LaBerge needing to stay impartial as the Chair of SC-222(IEEE Code 3). By releasing this paper, it could negatively affect Inmarsat and positively impact Iridium.
2. Dr. LaBerge should communicate the content of the paper to the individual parties and let them work it out.
 - a. For the same reason as number 1 this is not the best course of action. This again gives Iridium the leg up being the competitor to Inmarsat, implying that Dr. LaBerge is not being impartial (IEEE code 3).
3. Dr. LaBerge should send the paper to the FCC and let them work it out.
 - a. While this is a viable option, it is not the best. This removes Dr. LaBerge for the issue and places all responsibility on the FCC.
4. Dr. LaBerge should not release the paper, but should not approve any new Iridium based documents until the issues identified in the paper are resolved. He should stay out of any discussions on resolution.
 - a. This seems to be the best option. It keeps Dr. LaBerge impartial and actively pushes both Iridium and Inmarsat to fix the issues at hand.
5. Dr. LaBerge should ignore the whole thing and just act as Chair in a fair and objective manner.
 - a. This would violate the most important rule about the health and safety of the public (Code 1). If the issue is real, it needs to be acknowledged.
6. Any other course of action different from these that your group might recommend.
 - a. None